

REMARKS

Claim Objections

Claim 1 has been amended, in view of the examiner's objections, to correct the references to a "system" and a "protocol" in the preamble.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 1, 4-9, 11-14, 16-20, and 27-31 were rejected by Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Saleh et al. (US 20030058804A1), hereafter Saleh.

In regards to the original independent Claim 1, Examiner stated that the elements of the claim were all anticipated by Saleh. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection. In particular, Applicant notes that amended Claim 1 provides that the system is operable to expand or summarize the routing information exchanged amongst nodes in the system based on their position in a multi-level hierarchy. Although the sizes of routing tables maintained in nodes of the Saleh system may differ in size, based on whether or not such nodes are border nodes, there is no suggestion in Saleh that the system is operable to expand or summarize the information exchanged amongst nodes of the Saleh system based on a rank of such nodes in a multi-level hierarchy.

With respect to independent Claim 19, Examiner stated that the elements of the claim were all anticipated by Saleh. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection. In particular, applicant notes that there is no suggestion of the application of a policy vector by Saleh, which is an element of the claim under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

The other claims rejected by Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) in view of Saleh depend from either Claim 1 or Claim 19. As the independent claims from which they

depend are not anticipated by Saleh, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these dependent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Examiner rejected Claims 2, 3, 10, 15, 21 – 26, each of which is cited as unpatentable over Saleh in view of other art cited by the Examiner for the respective claims. Applicant notes that these claims all depend from either Claim 1 or Claim 19, as discussed above, and Applicant has demonstrated above that Saleh does not disclose all of the elements in the independent claims. Accordingly, the claims rejected by Examiner under 35 USC § 103 include elements which are not disclosed in Saleh, and which Examiner has not shown to be present in or anticipated by the other art cited by the Examiner in the rejection. In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection of these claims.

Conclusion

Applicants submit that the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is, therefore, respectfully requested.

If in the opinion of the Examiner a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (650) 838-4383.

Application No. 10/648,758
Amendment dated December 11, 2007
Reply to Office Action of June 11, 2007

Docket No.: 41434-8003.US00

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-2207, under Order No. 41434-8003.US00 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: December 11, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By _____

Shaalu Mehra

Registration No.: 44,934
PERKINS COIE LLP
101 Jefferson Drive
Menlo Park, California 94025-1114
(650) 838-4300
(650) 838-4350 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant